George Lardner, newsroom
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washingtom, DC 20071

8/26/93

Dear George,

If you have to get your review in by Monday this will reach you after your return and after you have turned your review in. I write for two purpose, to explain why for the first time in what is it now, more than 25 years, I was angry with you; and to tell you why I said that the time will come when you will be ashamed of the review you very clearly indicated you intended writing.

I think we have shown how men can disgaree and get along. We have had strongly different views on the JFK assassination but we neither lacked trust in each other. I believe that if you think back over all those years you will not recall a time when I was not honest with you and that you will not recall a time I misinformed you.

I lost patience with you and was angry when you were not the man I've known all these years in that you absolutely refused to think. You reflected a determinedly unthinking partisan. That may be acceptable in a review but I prefer not to think so. I was so disappointed in you, so upset that when, from the convoluted hours I live, as you know I do, I was eating supper when you phoned and when we finished talking I could not finish it. And it was our first fresh corn of the season!

One example of this is one aspect of that fifth of Willis' pictures. Of the several evidential and by this I mean factual points it represents you just would not face the fact that it is a physical impossibility for it to have been taken at any time other than before Zapruder Frame 202. While there is no question from the evidence that he took it in reaction to hearing the shot, and it was the first one, my point was separate from that. It was that it was a physical impossibility for him to have taken it later.

I have no objection to your trying your thoughts out on me or a number of them. That is the right way. What I objected to is your unthinking determination to agree with all Posner wrote, regardless. But everything I told you is factually correct. And I think that before long I realized that you were being suckered and then I think I believe you wanted that. You really abandonned all your critical faculties. I've not known you to do that before. I intend no insult, but you came across to me like a Blakey.

Lest you misunderstand what my attitude toward Posner was until I learned from you what he says(as I told you I did not get the UN News because when I read the book that would turn out to be a waste of time), I enclose what I wrote him three weeks ago. That he has not responded means nothing. He had no occasion to. As you will see, it is not unfriendly. I wrote it months after knowing in general what his publisher said the book says and how it says it. After I had written,as I can show you, for my own purposes, that it is impossible to do with an enhancement of the Zapruder film what his publisher, as

it turns out accurately, says he did. We did not discuss it but the most obvious thing is that the film cannot reflect any other shooting. This is but one aspect of the fact that enhancement cannot put into the film what is not there. Another is that the film is not the only evidence on anything at all. That is one reason why I tried to illustrate with the Fifth Willis picture. You will recall that after you told me he places the first shot at Frame 162 I kept asking you when he placed the second one.

Another illustration of why I said he was not being honest is his misuse of Willis' daughter. Those were not good sources at all. I asked you if he cited her Commission testimony. You were not in a position to check it so after we spoke I checked it. He could not use it because it refutes what he misused her for. He did not recognize the first shot as a shot. She thought it was a firecracker. So she did not turn to the TSBD thinking a shot came from it. He had to know that. So he lied by referring to second-hand or remote sources of years later. Even then his rubbish is based on an earlier shot than what she, too, told the Commission was possible.

As you should remember, I have never taken the position that everything the Commission, FBI, Secret Service or any other agency said is wrong. You know my books come entirely from what they said and their dependable evidence shows. And that is all I used in talking to you yesterday. Posner has become part of the new wave of commercializing sycophants who say that while everything the commission did was wrong they lucked into the right answer anyway.

You told me Posner reflected an impressive knowledge of the 26 volumes. You did not say a word about any use he made of the information available later. I have no reason to believe that of the 724 pages his wife noted she copied here he drew on any of that. Her receipt, by the way, reflects their copying fof three days when here.

I was offended by his imposing on my trust. That accounted for part of my anger. As you also know, I have always made all I have available to those I know I'll disagree with. That is not what angered me. His false colors is what did as you made them clear to me. You will see that before I knew more than his publisher said I regretted that he had not tested anything, that he lacked devil's advocacy. When it is available and is not used that represents an intent to say what he was determined to say regardless of fact or truth. And your attitude was similar. That was a real disappointment to me. I do not remember your ever reflecting that before.

What you reflected is a determination to be a propagandist rather than a reviewer who has a reporter's experience and traditional attitude. Which is what he is, no more than a commercializing, exploiting propagandist. Why else, for example, would he not check a single thing? Or ask if any of the records available after the Commission's life ended disputed anything he was going to say?

There is an ego that typifies all those guys. They do not need fact. They know it

because they are that omniscient or they just make it up. All of them, and he is no exception. Both sides. They can, they do, and Posner does ignore what they know that proves them wrong. With him the Willis girl's testimony is but one example. What he says about what he says she did, which is in itself not true, is not relevant to the actual timing of the shots in her testimony or where she was when. She is quite specific on that and nothing her father said or did not say figures in it at all. It is in Volume VII and she is pretty explicit, repeatedly, on where she was when the shots were fired and where she was when she saw she head explode, right opposite the Stemmons Freeway sign. Do you think she ran more than 11 miles per hour?

As you gave it to me, which is how Wrone also did after reading the magazine, what he said about this missed shot in a physical impossibility or close to it. That is why I said he had another magic budlet and adds a magic tree.

Also addressing his honesty is the unquestionable fact that he knew the hole made in the curbstone was ~~not~~ patched before Shaneyfelt went through the charade of having it dug up. He knew it from Post Mortem, which has the before and after pictures and from the Gemberling synopsis that is quite explicit in stating that there had been than mark and it was not there when they dug it up. That is in a folder on my desk I show everyone.

I am not certain but I may also have shown him the technicians report that confirms what is so visible, that the curbstone had been patched. For your information, that was when Oswald could not have done it, and by May of 1963. Liebeler knew it, too, and he had knowledge that Tague had taken pictures, thought he had prints from it, when there is no Commission or FBI record reflecting that it had any way of having any such knowledge. So, there was a magical patch the curbstone grew? Another proof that there was no conspiracy? And it was just by accident that the one spectrogrpahic film that is missing is the one of the testing of that patch? The test that showed only two of the seven elements of the hullet's core? Do I have reason to question his honesty, or wonder about your abandinment of your ~~and~~ ordinarily excellent critical faculties? Dr do you use them and not use them when you want to or do not want to?

I am sorry to say it, sorrier to believe it, but I do believe that in time, and it may not be much time, you will be ashmed of not only this review but that you were capable of it.

Not knowing that you would be asked to do the review and not knowing what if you were asked your review would say, if I had thought of it, I would have thought that you were the one reporter who would see through this scam, that your beliefs would not blind you to the indecency, the ugliness of it. It is really an outrageous thing that most reviewers or reporters would have trouble examining criticially. But not you. Only you did not want to. And that is not the you I've known for so long. It is disappointing.

At this point I left for my early-morning walking. I then thought of this more. I do not want you to misunderstand. I have not from the time I knew that Posner deceived me on

what his book was to be,and I knew that from his publsiher as quoted in PW, had the illusion that I could do anything about it. There is other reflection that I was not even angry in other letters I wrote him, asking if he had returned only-copies of pictures I had loaned him. You also know that because of my age and illnesses I long ago decided that the nost useful thing I can do is perfect the record for history. This meanans including all the whoring with our history. From what you told me Posner is a ~~make~~ mark. (I regret you have made a mark of yourself, but ~~that~~ that I will not write about.)Posner and Random house provide a magnificent example of the abject and determined book-publisher failures on this subject. (I am reminded that when RH read my ms in 1965 they ~~rejected~~ rejected it on the sole basis that they do not publish new authors!)

Wrone met me for breakfast ~~lunch~~. He worked in DC yesterday and returns to Wisconsin today. (He was here along with other professorial friends for the awarding of honorary doctorates to Lil and to me by Hood Sunday and he remained to make copies of records for his own work.) He bought copies of Posner's book for both of us and I have an idea of some from ~~one~~ what he ~~actread~~. From that I assure you that I understated when I said he was merely dishonest. But that can now wait for when I can document it, as I will.

I wanted to say this before taking a peek at his book. Wrone had told me of some of his nasty cracks about me. I checked the index and then checked the notes to page 150, where he lies about what I wrote and is careful not to cite where I wrote it. I also did that without any Garrison connection. The Camp Street address was that of the back door to Ronnie Caire's office. I juggled no numbers at all and we all knew very well where Bringuir's and Pena's places of business were. He is a determined liar in saying that "1032 Canal was at the corner of Canal and Ramparts." It was not at the corner at all. I remember all this so well I checked Oswald in New Orleans. I ~~enclose~~ enclose pages ~~78 and 79~~ and 80.I remember quite clearly that the empty lot was not the corner lot, as he says , and because I was there, as you'll see on 80, recorded the number of the next highest numbered property on that side of the street.I did that without any help from Garrison, as he says on 150, but to add to my book then written. I wrote it before ever going to New Orleans, to be independent.

What Wrone had called to my attention as an intendedly dishonest reference to me is in the note of 433. Whether he lies or just makes a mistake, the latter being no endorsement of the rest of his book. you know very well yhat I did not wait until Garrison's "investigation ended ignominiously" and what I then did is considerably understated as "backed away from him." I do not recall that letter to Playboy and do not recall thus that it was published. If he copied it from my files I have no objection. But how can he honestly cite that and ignore all else I did later and even pretend to the slightest smidgeon of honesty.

I've gone no farthur now and won't for a while. I made a list of citations to me

So you cab, if you'd like, check them for yourself. You might wonder what kind of man it is who would come here, take my time for at least three days, get unsupervised access to all I have, including all that the government said about me, and then can contrive this kind of faction to defame me. From what Wrone told me there are innumerbale deliberate dishoneties throughout the book. Those he mentioned from the two chapters he had read by 6 a.m. when we met for breakfast, are not and cannot be accidental errors. This is true on 20-1. I copied the notes to what I wanted to quote from what Dave told me. Thus as he goes out of his way to defame and deprecate others I am confident that he lies in saying that I wrote of the 15 year old Oswald what in a different place I said about the older Oswald. (page 18) Thus you will find no source cited, page of notes also enclosed.

11 n
13 n
18 n
20 n
150 n
414
415 n
420
433
448
453
454

Then (11) I am somehow derelect in not going fof this crap im my book not about Oswald but about the Commission, in "not telling the reader "that Marguerite and Lee Lived with the Pics. (I did, too) can you think of any damned reason why I should have? Or do you agree that we shpuld all corrupt our thinking to conform with his? I am not bothering to check what I actually said where he quotes me because it has no significance at all but I also attach the notes for that page so you can see he makes no references to what he says he quotes.

I am sorry for you George, and for your vesting your personal and professional integrity is a man as devoid of honor, integrity or ordinary, everyday morals and ethics. If you read just these notes you should have had some question at the very least about how faithul he is and un detected the ohvious signs of ulterior purposes. I'm so sorry you delayed so long in phoning me because when you have to give your review in Monday you now lack the time for the independent checking that with Wrone here I could have suggested to you because he got and read US News and then read two chapters last night.

I hope you can begin to see what I said above that the George you reflected last night is not the one I've known all these years. That George would have wanted to do serious checking and would not have agrued against what he did not want to believe.

With sincere regrets,

Harold

In laughing with Wrone about that silly contrivance to criticize me about that Canal Street stuff Wrone told me the only person he knows who went with that nonsense in Bringuier, who told it to Wrone or has it in his silly book. Posner has no source but Wrone remembered his thanks to Bringuier for his XXXXXXXX "clarifications." (page 502) What a source!